From: Holsapple, Michael [holsappl@anr.msu.edu]
Sent: 4/7/2016 12:25:21 PM
To: Barone, Patrizia [Patrizia.Barone@unilever.com]; 'Charlie Arnot' [charliea@cmabuildstrust.com]; Cohen, Samuel M [scohen@unmc.edu]; 'Howard, Paul' [Paul.Howard@fda.hhs.gov]; 'ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com' [ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com]; Craig Llewellyn [cllewellyn@coca-cola.com]; 'tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu' [tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu]; 'joseph_scimeca@cargill.com' [joseph_scimeca@cargill.com]; Spencer, Pamela (PJ) [PJSpencer@dow.com]; Keri Szejda [ksfehren@asu.edu]; Thomas, Russell [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=12f119e7a3ee447499f3d6ab5d20daeb-Thomas, Rus]
CC: Adelle Simmons [asimmons@msu.edu]
Subject: RE: EU Study identifies key topics for future work in food safety

Dear Colleagues –

Good morning. I am happy to build an agenda that includes some discussion on the EFSA prioritization, as well as similar concepts from other organizations. We need to make sure that we are all on the 'same page'. In the **Key Conclusions and Action Items** document that I distributed after our call in February, we captured the following . . .
"Moving toward integrating bench science projects into the CRIS Research Strategy triggered several **KEY CONCLUSION**s, including the following:
- Research proposals need to be evaluated in the context of resource allocations.
- We need to develop some criteria to assist in how we evaluate research proposals.
- The concept of a funnel – with defined filters – was identified.
- It was emphasized that we don't want to over-reach.
- Ultimately, the CRIS Research Strategy should address topics that will improve public health, and that will have regulatory impact / regulatory acceptance.

The above discussion raised more questions than answers or next steps. **ACTION ITEM**: Because all of the points raised above reflect the ultimate emerging issues process that needs to be developed and implemented within CRIS, all members of the EIC are asked to think about this process between now and our next call in April, and to provide any and all suggestions to Mike."
. . . I believe that we would look at priorities from EFSA and others as possible components of the "CRIS filter". I don't want to see us get caught engaging in a serious critique of priorities established by other organizations. We need to focus on developing our own criteria.

Make sense? Thanks. Mike

From: Barone, Patrizia [mailto:Patrizia.Barone@unilever.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2016 11:29 PM
To: Holsapple, Michael <holsappl@anr.msu.edu>; 'Charlie Arnot' <charliea@cmabuildstrust.com>; Cohen, Samuel M <scohen@unmc.edu>; 'Howard, Paul' <Paul.Howard@fda.hhs.gov>; 'ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com' <ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com>; Craig Llewellyn <cllewellyn@coca-cola.com>; 'tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu' <tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu>; 'joseph_scimeca@cargill.com' <joseph_scimeca@cargill.com>; Spencer, Pamela (PJ) <PJSpencer@dow.com>; Keri Szejda <ksfehren@asu.edu>; 'thomas.russell@epa.gov' <thomas.russell@epa.gov>
Cc: Adelle Simmons <asimmons@msu.edu>
Subject: RE: EU Study identifies key topics for future work in food safety

Michael,

Yes, I support including a discussion of EFSA priorities.

Howard/Thomas: should we also include FDA and EPA's priorities relating to ingredient safety? (excluding FSMA)

Cheers,
Patrizia

From: Holsapple, Michael [mailto:holsappl@anr.msu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2016 3:13 PM
To: 'Charlie Arnot' <charliea@cmabuildstrust.com>; Barone, Patrizia <Patrizia.Barone@unilever.com>; Cohen, Samuel M <scohen@unmc.edu>; 'Howard, Paul' <Paul.Howard@fda.hhs.gov>; 'ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com' <ji-eun.lee@kellogg.com>; Craig Llewellyn <cllewellyn@coca-cola.com>; 'tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu' <tphillips@cvm.tamu.edu>; 'joseph_scimeca@cargill.com' <joseph_scimeca@cargill.com>; Spencer, Pamela (PJ) <PJSpencer@dow.com>; Keri Szejda <ksfehren@asu.edu>; 'thomas.russell@epa.gov' <thomas.russell@epa.gov>
Cc: Adelle Simmons <asimmons@msu.edu>
Subject: FW: EU Study identifies key topics for future work in food safety

Dear Colleagues –

I am just passing along a synopsis of the recently released report from EFSA in which they prioritized issues impacting food safety. While it is important to emphasize that CRIS' focus is on ingredient safety – and is therefore broader than food – I thought this was an interesting perspective.

Because we will be getting together for the next EIC call at the end of this month – specifically, Thursday, April 28th – from 1:30 to 3:00 (EDT) – I wanted your feedback on whether we should include a discussion of the EFSA priorities. Just a thought. I would appreciate some quick feedback.

Cheers. Mike

From: IFLR
Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2016 11:24 AM
To: Derksen, Frederik <derksen@anr.msu.edu>; Buhler, Douglas <buhler@anr.msu.edu>; Wilkins, Melinda <wilkinsm@msu.edu>; Julie Funk <funkj@cvm.msu.edu>; Baker, John <baker@anr.msu.edu>; Holsapple, Michael <holsappl@anr.msu.edu>; Ng, Perry <ngp@msu.edu>
Subject: EU Study identifies key topics for future work in food safety

You may want to share this with faculty, staff and students.

Final report on 'the identification of food safety priorities using the Delphi technique'

EXTERNAL SCIENTIFIC REPORT
APPROVED: 04/03/2016
PUBLISHED: 31/03/2016

Study identifies key topics for future work in food safety

A study commissioned by EFSA to **prioritise future work in the area of food safety has identified 28 key topics.** The results of this study will guide collaboration between EFSA and EU Member States and contribute to the development of a common risk assessment agenda.

***

The 28 topics are grouped in five categories: chemical, microbiological and environmental risk assessment, nutrition and a generic category of cross-cutting issues. Using an aggregate rating measure, two topics in each category were identified as top-rated. These include: common data collection across Europe, risk assessment of aggregated exposure, antimicrobial resistance, zoonoses, environmental contaminants in food, and the development of standard risk-benefit assessment methods of foods.

The 28 topics were as follows, according to their domain (with the letters following the 'generic' topics indicating the specific domains to which the y applied):

Generic:

• Methods and systems for identifying emerging (food) risks (e.g. new food-borne diseases) [ME]

• Development of standard risk-benefit assessment methods [C E N]

• Common data collection/surveillance scheme (over many domains) across Europe [C M N]

• Multiple contaminant impacts on the risk profile of foods [C M E N]

• Risks/benefits of botanicals/herbals in food supplements [C N]

• Allergenicity/ food allergens in general (risk assessment and management) [C N]

• Aggregated exposure (as per cocktail effects, but including environmental as well as food exposures) [C E N]

Chemical [C]:

• Harmonisation of methods for risk assessment of chemical contaminants

• Cumulative exposure assessment (e.g. for pesticide residues/ PAHs)

• Infant and baby food

• Emerging contaminants

Microbiological [M]:

• Systems for monitoring and characterising microbes isolated from food, environment and human illness cases

• Improve the use of genetic data (e.g. from whole genome sequencing) for risk assessment of microbiological contaminants

• Antimicrobial/ antibiotic resistance

• Microbial food pathogens (in general)

• Food-borne viruses (in general) (e.g. Hepatitis A and Norovirus in fruit and vegetables) EU risk assessment agenda

• Campylobacter (e.g. in poultry and ready to eat foods)

• Zoonoses (in general, including bio-hazards, MRSA etc.)

Environmental [E]:

• Improving information on the occurrence and spread of harmful organisms at the level of individual EU countries

• Ribonucleic acid interference (RNAi) applied to food producing organisms as pesticide, veterinary medicine, or newly expressed trait in genetically modified crops

• Better understand biological organisms and plant substances used in crop protection (so reducing the need for chemicals e.g. pesticides)

• The impact of chemicals on the ecosystem (release of chemicals to the environment)

• Presence/detection of environmental contaminants (e.g. from agricultural, industrial or household sources) in food

• Cocktail effects (the health risk assessment of chemical mixtures e.g. food additives)

Nutrition [N]:

• Indirect effects on human health due to modified agricultural practices (e.g. via reduction of pesticide use, changed content of mycotoxins, etc.)

• Developing standard biomarkers of intake and/or exposure to contaminants

• Food supplements risk/benefits

• Determination of allergen thresholds (clinical studies), in conjunction with immunochemical measurements of allergens in foods

Out of these 28 topics, the two that were top-rated, according to the aggregate rating measure, for the four sets of experts (according to domain) were as follows:

Chemical:

• Common data collection /surveillance scheme (over many domains) across Europe

• Aggregated exposure (as per cocktail effects, but including environmental as well as food exposures)

Microbiological:

• Antimicrobial/ antibiotic resistance

• Zoonoses (in general, including bio-hazards, MRSA etc.)

Environmental:

• Aggregated exposure (as per cocktail effects, but including environmental as well as food exposures)

• Presence/detection of environmental contaminants (e.g. from agricultural, industrial or household sources) in food

Nutrition:

• Aggregated exposure (as per cocktail effects, but including environmental as well as food exposures)

• Development of standard risk-benefit assessment methods (of foods)

***

The second part of the questionnaire (labelled: 'Section 1: Food Safety Priorities') requested respondents to **list three topics in food safety** that they believed **should be the focus of future collaboration** between Member States and EFSA **where the greatest impact of strengthening risk assessment and addressing important public health concerns might be achieved.** This was a compromise between eliciting a varied and full list of priorities from the experts and keeping the survey short in order to maximize the number of responses. When choosing these three topics the **participants were asked to consider ones that met the following criteria of prioritization**:
• **Resources** (collaborative work in the area should help saving resources or help providing additional resources)
• **Timeliness (potential projects should be medium to long-term in nature)**
• **Added value** (collaborative work in the area should add value to support risk assessment activities)
• **Potential to improve harmonization** (collaborative work in the area should help to improve the harmonisation of risk assessment worldwide)

***

condense the 240 individual suggested priorities into a more manageable number.

Sometimes essentially similar topics were categorised differently (e.g. a particular topic might be identified as primarily 'chemical' by one expert, but as 'environmental' by another) so some topics occurred in more than one domain, but not in the generic list.

There are **12 items in the Generic list, 18 in the Microbiological, 36 in the Chemical, 31 in the Environmental, and 25 in the Nutrition, totalling 123 topics** (meaning that we succeeded in cutting the original list by a little under a half). The list of topics – and the number of experts suggesting them – is shown in Appendix 4.
SEE ATTACHED LIST – Appendix 4.

Final report on 'the identification of food safety priorities using the Delphi technique'

[Emphasis added]

Mary Anne Verleger, Course Manager

Institute for Food Laws & Regulations
Michigan State University
G. Malcolm Trout Food Science Building
469 Wilson Road, Room 139
East Lansing, MI 48824-1224
Telephone: (517) 355-8295
Fax: (517) 432-1492
web: http://www.iflr.msu.edu
email: IFLR@msu.edu